

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 13030) granting an increase of pension to John H. Steele; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARTER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 13031) granting an increase of pension to George A. Spofford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BENJAMIN L. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 13032) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Weeks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13033) granting a pension to Herman Lazarus; to the Committee on Pensions.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, October 1, 1918.

(Legislative day of Monday, September 30, 1918.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon.

RELIEF OF JOHN CHICK.

Mr. DREW. Mr. President, I should like to ask unanimous consent to call up a bill on the calendar, the bill (S. 3985) for the relief of John Chick.

Mr. THOMPSON. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Baird	Henderson	New	Smith, Mich.
Bankhead	Johnson, S. Dak.	Norris	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Jones, N. Mex.	Nugent	Smoot
Brandegge	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Sterling
Calder	Kellogg	Page	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Kendrick	Penrose	Thomas
Colt	Kenyon	Phelan	Thompson
Culberson	Kirby	Pittman	Townsend
Cummins	Knox	Poindexter	Trammell
Curtis	Lenroot	Pomerene	Underwood
Dillingham	Lewis	Ransdell	Yardaman
Drew	Lodge	Reed	Wadsworth
Fernald	McCumber	Robinson	Walsh
France	McKellar	Saulsbury	Warren
Gerry	McLean	Shafroth	Watson
Goff	McNary	Sheppard	Wilfley
Gronna	Martin, Ky.	Shields	Williams
Gulon	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ariz.	Wolcott
Hale	Myers	Smith, Ga.	
Hardwick	Nelson	Smith, Md.	

Mr. MYERS. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] is temporarily detained from the Chamber on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-eight Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The Senator from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent for the consideration of a bill, which will be read.

The Secretary read the bill (S. 3985) for the relief of John Chick, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the pension laws and the laws conferring rights and privileges upon honorably discharged soldiers, John Chick, late of Company K, Third Regiment United States Artillery, shall be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States as a member of said company and regiment on the 2d day of August, 1865: *Provided,* That no pension shall accrue prior to the passage of this act, and no pay nor bounty shall become due or payable by virtue thereof.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 284).

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by the President of the United States to the Senate yesterday on the question of suffrage be made a public document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by G. F. Turner, one of its clerks, announced that the House insists upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1419) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of dams across

navigable waters," approved June 21, 1906, as amended by the act approved June 23, 1910, and to provide for the improvement and development of waterways for the uses of interstate and foreign commerce, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SIMS, Mr. FERRIS, Mr. LEVER, Mr. ESCH, Mr. SINNOTT, and Mr. HAUGEN managers at the conference on the part of the House.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 334) making appropriations for certain necessary operations of the Government for the month of October, 1918, and for other purposes, and it was thereupon signed by the President pro tempore.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

A bill and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 4967) granting an increase of pension to Aaron H. Perry (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GORE:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 178) to make citizenship of the United States a prerequisite to a vote for Senators or Representatives in Congress of the United States or for electors for President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on Pensions.

THE REVENUE.

Mr. GORE submitted five amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 12863) to provide revenue, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

STIMULATION OF AGRICULTURE—CONFERENCE REPORT (S. DOC. NO. 285).

Mr. GORE. I ask unanimous consent to present a conference report on House bill 11945, the food-production bill. I will not ask for its consideration at this moment. I suggest that the report be printed. I want to try to bring it up to-day if I can. We have agreed upon everything except the rents amendment, and on that we have reached a disagreement. I shall at the proper time move to accept the report and further insist upon the rent amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEWIS in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the report will be printed and lie on the table.

The report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11945) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the purposes of the act entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense by stimulating agriculture and facilitating the distribution of agricultural products," and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 14, 17, 20, 29, and 30.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9, 11, 12, 16, 19, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, and 31, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language and figures stricken out by the Senate amendment insert the following: "market news service on grain, hay, feeds, and seeds, \$150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15a, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language and the figures stricken out by the Senate amendment insert the following: "food and fertilizer surveys of the United States, \$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the Senate amendment insert "\$1,955,608"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the words "grape sirup" and insert in lieu thereof "grape sirups"; and the House agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the language stricken out by the Senate amendment and insert the following language after the word "thereof" in the restored language on page 10, line 7: "which are now or heretofore have been used for such purposes"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have been unable to agree on the amendment of the Senate numbered 28.

T. P. GORE,
E. D. SMITH,
HOKE SMITH,
JOSEPH I. FRANCE,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

A. F. LEVER,
GORDON LEE,
E. S. CANDLEE,
G. N. HAUGEN,
J. C. McLAUGHLIN,

Managers on the part of the House.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 200) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I very much fear that "a little group of wilful men" are about to defeat a measure which the President of the United States has declared in all the richness of his vocabulary and with all the emphasis which he could command is vitally necessary for the successful prosecution of the war.

It is a strange spectacle, Mr. President, to me, and I address myself mainly to my brother Senators upon the other side of the Chamber. You are about to flout, disparage, repudiate, and humiliate your President. I sincerely hope that there will not fall upon you that severe condemnation which was at a former time visited upon another "little group of wilful men" who desired nothing more than an opportunity to amend a measure that was then before the Senate.

You are driven to one of two positions. You either refuse to accept the solemn declaration of the President that the passage of this joint resolution is vitally necessary to the prosecution of the war, or you choose to defeat the right of women in this country to vote rather than to aid him in the great conflict in which he is engaged. You refuse to give to him an instrumentality which he has asserted to you with the utmost seriousness is necessary to enable him to accomplish the great purposes he has in view.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. HARDWICK. A question only. The Senator is an advocate of this proposition. Does he regard it as a war measure in itself?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I will come to that question a little later. I intend to state my position with regard to the matter with the utmost frankness, but I am now addressing myself to men most of whom I have heard declare over and over again that whatever the President regarded as essential and necessary to the prosecution of the war they would give him, without regard to their own conclusions on the subject. I have heard, and all of you have heard, the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] lecture those of us who now and then insisted we had a right to use our own consciences and our own judgment with regard to measures that were pending before Congress, saying that when the President, who was not only your leader but our leader in the great struggle that is now in progress, declared any proposal or any legislation was necessary to enable him to successfully carry forward his work you would vote for it, that you would accept his judgment. I have heard the senior Senator from Mississippi hour after hour denounce those who undertook to assert their own judgment. Why does he not accept the judgment of the President now at this vital moment? Why does he repudiate him now if he was willing to accept him then without inquiry?

I have heard my dear friend, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] time after time, in measures of the utmost importance, declare with all the fervor of his eloquence that we had no right to question the necessity of a particular enactment if the President told us that it was necessary for the suc-

cessful prosecution of the war. I listened last night to the very clear and lucid statement of the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM]. It has not been long since I listened to him, standing where the Senator from North Carolina now sits, when the Senate had under consideration a bill which bears the name of the great Senator from North Carolina, as I recollect it, declare that he intended to vote for it simply because the President had declared that it was necessary that he should have the unbridled power conferred upon him in that bill for the successful prosecution of the war.

Mr. BECKHAM. Mr. President, I think the Senator is not quite correct in that statement. I did not state that that was simply the reason why I would vote for that measure. I undertook in that address to give other reasons why I should vote for it.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from Kentucky to accept without question the judgment of the President upon that subject. I was not present when the bill which transferred the telegraph and telephone companies to the possession of the President was considered. It was understood when I left Washington for a very brief visit to my home that there would be given an opportunity on the part of those of us who questioned the exercise of that power to inquire into its necessity. I am told—I have it only upon hearsay—that the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, who yesterday lifted up his voice in those mellifluous and eloquent phrases which would deceive the very elect, insisted then that there should be no inquiry into the necessity of taking over the telegraph and the telephone companies; that it had been asserted by the President and those who were expressing his views that it was necessary that these facilities should come into the possession of the Government, and that it was the duty of Congress, without any inquiry, without investigation, without a word of testimony, save the declaration of the Executive, to transfer to him that great power. Why is the Senator from South Carolina now questioning the wisdom of the President? Why is he now saying that woman suffrage, as contemplated by the adoption of this joint resolution, is not necessary to the successful prosecution of the war?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, "the Senator from South Carolina" certainly would not insult the intelligence of this body by saying that a temporary surrender of a power that belongs to the people, in order to win the war, and that we may get back as soon as the war is over, is on all fours with an attempt to change the perpetual and fundamental form of our Government.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I am not asserting any parallel between the two instances. I am asserting that in everything else, save woman suffrage, so far as it has developed in the legislation since the war began, the great majority of the Senate has been willing to accept, and has accepted implicitly, the judgment and the determination of the President that a particular thing was necessary in order vigorously, energetically, and successfully to bring this war to an end and to compass the nations of the earth after the conflict shall cease. It matters not what the character of the question may be, you either accept his view of it or you repudiate it. If you repudiate it, and he thereby is unable to bring the war to an end, to accomplish the peace which he hopes to accomplish and establish the conditions throughout the world that he hopes to establish, you are responsible for his failure in that regard.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope that the President may deal kindly and leniently with those who are refusing to remove this obstacle which stands in his way. It has not been very long since the President retired the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] from public life. Why? Because he refused at all times to obey the commands which were issued for his direction. The junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] suffered the same fate. How do you hope to escape? Mr. President, my Democratic friends are either proceeding upon the hypothesis that the President is insincere or that they may be able to secure an immunity from him that these other unfortunate aspirants for office failed to secure.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President—

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSON. The Senator from Iowa seems to be oblivious of the fact that this is not the first time in the history of the world that the voice of the prophet has not been heard in the wilderness. [Laughter.]

Mr. CUMMINS. Quite true. The voice of the prophet was heard in the wilderness very clearly and obeyed implicitly until he spoke in behalf of humanity, until he spoke in favor of the enfranchisement of one-half of the population of the United States. It was only then, may I suggest to the Senator from

Minnesota, that the voice was lost, or at least that it was not heeded.

But what shall I say to my associates upon this side of the Chamber? It has been the distinguishing characteristic of the minority leader of the Senate that he was always ready to stand by the President in the prosecution of the war. I do not say that upon every occasion he has abdicated his own judgment, but the one cry has been, "Let us do whatever the President believes ought to be done in order to carry on the conflict successfully and to bring the United States into that high position of honor which we hope she will occupy at the end of the war."

I have not escaped the criticism of my political associates from time to time, because I have insisted that when a proposal was made for the prosecution of the war it was for me to determine whether it ought to be accepted or rejected. I, together with some other Senators, whose names I will not mention, have been crucified on every cross in America because we would not yield our judgment as legislators, and I am amazed at our leader, not only for political reasons—those are unworthy of consideration, although he might bear them in mind, possibly, now and then—I have been amazed that our political leader in the Senate does not sense the situation and do what he can do toward the accomplishment of this great purpose.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] is the only—I will not say "the only," but he is almost the only logical and consistent Senator upon the other side of the Chamber; he has maintained the attitude which he now insists upon from the beginning; but how the rest of you, or most of the rest of you, will square what you are about to do with your protestations and assertions in the past I am utterly unable to perceive.

Now, I answer the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK]. I do not put my support of the resolution for woman suffrage on the ground that it is a war measure. I have been for woman suffrage, expending in its behalf all the energies that I had for more than a quarter of a century. It is a little abhorrent to me, I will confess, to hear it said that women ought to be given the right to vote because a war is in progress. I have no doubt that their enfranchisement will help to win the war, but they are entitled to suffrage without regard to the existence of war. They are entitled to the suffrage because, until it is given to them, this is not a perfect republic; until they are given the power to select representatives who shall make or help to make their laws and help to execute them this is not a true democracy. I am for this resolution because I believe that the Government of the future will be a wiser and better and juster government if women vote than if they are excluded from the vote, as they have been heretofore.

It is a strange thing to me—and now I address myself to both sides, all sides, and from the very depths of my heart—that 33 or 34 men who happen to be for the time being Senators of the United States are about, if appearances indicate the outcome, to deny to the people of the United States the opportunity to determine for themselves whether or not they desire the Constitution to be amended in this respect. What a situation! More than one-half, I am sure, of all of the men of the United States are in favor of submitting this resolution to the States for ratification or rejection; a very large and overwhelming proportion of the women are in favor of submitting it; the House of Representatives by a two-thirds majority has declared for its submission; the sentiment in its favor is everywhere; and now 33 men out of 100,000,000 people are about to arrogate to themselves the privilege and the power of preventing the electors throughout the country from expressing their judgment with regard to woman suffrage. It is a responsibility that I would not want to bear.

I know that it is according to the letter of the Constitution. Our forefathers naturally were somewhat afraid of the people, and they formulated, and there was adopted, a Constitution that was extremely difficult to amend. I believe that the Constitution should not be amended except after full consideration and after grave and serious reflection; but I do not believe that 33 men in the Senate of the United States should have the right to say that an amendment should not be submitted to the people for such disposition among them as they might see fit to make of it. We will not have a true democracy until that part of the Constitution is amended as well as the part now proposed to be amended.

I do not wonder that the President stands here and appeals with all his earnestness and with all his heart to put him in a position where he can go before the world and say that if the letter of our Government requires two-thirds majority in the Senate before an amendment to the Constitution is proposed, at least the Senate was democratic enough, liberal enough, and generous enough to submit a proposal that has the support of so large a proportion of our people.

So far as I am concerned, if I were opposed to woman suffrage I would vote to submit this resolution to the people. I think whenever there is a fair and reasonable sentiment or demand for the submission of a constitutional amendment that Senators ought not to allow their individual convictions to prevent the submission to our sovereigns of a proposed change in the fundamental charter of the country. We are not the custodians of the Constitution; we did not make the Constitution; and Congress ought to have nothing to do, logically speaking, with amendments to the Constitution. Amendments ought to be initiated either by the States whose agreement formed the Constitution or by a petition of the people themselves, and I think both courses should be permitted under the law.

I sincerely hope that those Senators who value Republican or Democratic principles, who believe that this is, or at least ought to be, a Government of the people, for the people, and by the people, will not stand in the way of doing this just and righteous thing.

Mr. President, the only argument which I have heard upon the other side of the question that has impressed me at all is the argument made by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK], which is that from the beginning the States were intended to have complete authority over the qualifications of the voters who were to vote either for Members of Congress, the President, or State officers, and that the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution is the only disregard of what he calls a fundamental compact lying beneath the Constitution itself. I disagree wholly with that view. It is not true, from my standpoint, that the Constitution intended that that subject should always remain at the disposal of the States. Why, the very first thing the Constitution did was to declare that—

The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Here is an explicit direction with regard to the qualifications of voters in the States for Members of the House of Representatives. It is quite true that it is not complete, it is not specific, it is not in detail; but it indicates that the framers of the Constitution never dreamed of allowing the States under all circumstances to decide what should be the qualifications of voters for Members of the House.

This same provision was carried forward into the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution, when Senators were made elective by the people instead of by the legislatures; and when we enacted the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution we entered the subject again.

The first section of the fourteenth amendment has been very much quoted, and is very well known; but the second section is one upon which we ought to dwell before we concede that this is a subject which should be confined to the legislation or decision of the State. That section reads in this way:

Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State, or the members of the legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being 21 years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens 21 years of age in such State.

Here is a direct and—if it were enforced—a most powerful and influential interference with the power of the State to deal with this subject without interference upon the part of the General Government. Every naturalization law which we have passed concerns and governs in a measure the suffrage in the States, and the right to legislate upon naturalization, and the terms upon which aliens may become citizens of this country, is complete. It has no limit whatever. It is reposed entirely in the Congress of the United States.

That is true, likewise, of our legislation respecting Indians. How do Indians get their right to vote? Will it be said that notwithstanding the legislation of Congress the States can deprive an Indian of the vote who, under our treaties with him or with his tribe, and our legislation made pursuant to them, has had the right to vote? Do you mean to say that the States can take away or alter or modify the privilege that is thus given?

It is all wrong to assume that the Federal Government has surrendered its authority to regulate and control the qualifications of voters in the various States. Logically speaking, and if I had my way about it, if I could bring about just that condition which I most desire, I would say that with regard to the qualifications of voters for Members of Congress, for Senators, or for electors, and such other elective Federal offices as we

may make in the future, if we make any, Congress should not only declare negatively who should not be excluded, but should declare affirmatively who should be admitted to vote. In other words, Congress should prescribe the qualifications.

I agree that, following this logical development of our system, the States should be permitted to determine the qualifications of the voters for State or local officers. I would have no objection in the world to that; but that is utterly impracticable. We can not hold two elections. The people have tried that plan, and have found it too inconvenient and too expensive to be followed; and therefore we are driven to the alternative. We must either allow the States to declare the qualifications for voters for Members of Congress and the President of the United States or we must undertake, in this negative way at least, to interfere with the qualifications of voters for State officers. The latter is the better way. The latter collides less frequently and less injuriously with the established practices of the people; and I, for one, have no hesitation whatever in going a very little way in that direction—and this joint resolution does not go a great way. It is negative, pure and simple.

If I had my way, I would prescribe the qualifications for the voters for Members of the House, the Senate, and the President; but this joint resolution does not propose that. It asks only the little thing that the States, in determining the qualifications of their voters, shall not discriminate against persons on account of sex. It is entirely compatible with the theory of our Constitution. It is entirely consistent and harmonious with the legislation which we have from time to time adopted with regard to suffrage and the right to vote.

Mr. President, I listened with tremendous interest to the speech made by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]; and I can not close what I am about to say without referring to it. He denounced in his terrific way, first, the women who lobby; second, the so-called militants who sought to bring their influence to bear upon the situation in rather a more forcible and decisive method than was employed by the national association.

So far as representations are concerned, so far as so-called lobbying is concerned, I marvel that the women have been as patient and forbearing as they have been. I think they have a God-given right to swarm about this Capitol, presenting not only to Members of Congress but to everyone else the injustice that is inflicted upon them and insisting upon the repair of that injustice. I do not set any limit to the energy and the persistence and the enthusiasm of women who are engaged in attempting to secure the right to participate in the affairs of a Government whose laws control and compel them.

So far as the militants are concerned, I did not believe in the campaign they were pursuing; but the only reason which led me to doubt or to disapprove it was because I did not think that it was the most effective and persuasive way in which to proceed. I did not believe, either, as I told them many, many times, that they ought to attempt to coerce the President of the United States into bringing his influence to bear upon Members of Congress. I do not believe in that any more now than I have believed in it throughout this administration. I have always protested against it, and if I maintain my senses and keep my reason I always shall protest against it.

But that was simply a question for them to determine; and if they thought that in accordance with the established custom the President should bring his influence to bear more effectively and emphatically than he had, they had a perfect right to burn his message; they had a perfect right to carry banners in Lafayette Park, in front of the White House, or anywhere else; they had a perfect right to bring their banners into the Capitol and display them with all the force and vigor which they could command. I did not agree with them; but they also were making a campaign for an inestimable and a fundamental right.

What would you have done, men, if you had been deprived of the right to vote? What would you have done if you had been deprived of the right of representation? Have the militants done anything worse than the revolutionary forces who gathered about the tea chests and threw them into the sea, and thereby lit the fires of a revolution which emancipated the whole world? Those men were criminals, according to the view of the Senator from Missouri. They did not obey the law; and therefore, according to his logic, they were unfit to become makers of law.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEWIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. REED. Of course, the Senator recognizes the fact that the gentlemen who constituted the Boston tea party were in a state of rebellion. It was their purpose to overthrow the Government and set up a new form of Government. Does the Senator put the ladies in that catalogue, and if not—

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Missouri is historically incorrect. The proposition to set up an independent government did not arise for some little time after the Boston tea party.

Mr. REED. Oh, yes; the Senator will agree with me, that the Boston tea party were a band of rebels who had not yet declared their independence, but were getting ready to do it. They had not made war on King George, but intended to do it. Surely the Senator does not mean that these dear ladies would really start a rebellion in the United States?

Mr. CUMMINS. I quite agree that the Boston incident was more vigorous than anything that has occurred in Washington; but I still want to be historically correct. The men of Boston who organized and carried out that protest against the taxes which had been levied upon the colonies were not rebels. They still believed that the King and Parliament would give to them the right of representation in the passage of laws which affected them and particularly the passage of laws which imposed taxes upon them. It was not until much later that the continued resistance of the King and Parliament to their just demands led to the proposal to organize an independent government.

Mr. REED. Are we to understand, pursuing the parallel of the Senator, that if we do not yield and give the ladies the right of suffrage they will set up an independent government?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not know what they would do. I do not think that is so improbable. You sneer about women voting, but why could they not run this Government as well as we can? I think sometimes if they could not do it better than we are doing it they have but little right to participation, because although they may not have established to the satisfaction of all Senators their competency to make laws and execute them, we have established very clearly to the world our partial incompetency to make laws and execute them. I do not say that we do not make many just laws and that we do not carry into effect many high, exalted principles, but we at least can not claim exemption from radical and sometimes fatal mistakes.

I recur to the militants. I do not believe they committed any crime; and while I had not one particle of sympathy with the manner in which they were conducting their campaign, I think their arrest and imprisonment and the treatment which they received while in confinement are a disgrace to the civilized world, and much the more a disgrace to the United States, which assumes to lead the civilized world in humane endeavor. They disturbed nobody save that disturbance which is common to the carrying forward of all propaganda by those who are intensely and vitally interested in it. I wish they had not done it, but I am not to be the judge of their methods so long as they confine themselves to those acts and to those words which are fairly directed to the accomplishment of their purposes. I can not accept the conclusion that because these women burned a message in Lafayette Park or because they carried banners upon the streets in Washington therefore they are criminals and therefore they are unfit to become participants with us in the affairs of the Republic.

This movement has been in progress for 40 years. It is not confined to any particular organization of women. I understand that by far the greater organization is the one whose activities were so beautifully portrayed in the eloquent address of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS]; but it is not even a nation-wide movement; it is a world-wide movement. If it were true that there have been excesses here and there in the conduct of the campaign, it is more than illogical, it is absurd, for anyone to contend that, therefore, the movement should fail and that therefore it is unjust and unfair and unwise to extend to the women of the land that privilege which we have monopolized for ourselves these many years.

Mr. President, we may be defeated now. These 33 or 34 men may assume the responsibility of denying to the millions of America the right to pass upon this fundamental advance in government. But they can no more arrest the onward sweep of this ocean of intelligence and sea of justice than though they were to attempt to force back the tides of the sea with their feeble hands. They may just now be able possibly to disappoint these millions of loyal, intelligent, God-fearing women, but they will not be able to disappoint them long.

Just a year or two ago the Senate could command only a majority for woman suffrage, and barely that. It now commands within one or two votes two-thirds of its membership. If that does not teach this "little group of willful men" something of the future, if it does not warn them of the advancing tide of public sentiment, nothing could admonish them.

Mr. President, we vote upon a question as vital as any which commanded the interest and the thought of our forefathers when they framed the Constitution under which we have lived so hap-

ply for more than a hundred years; and I can only hope that each vote may be cast remembering that into the hands of that vote is committed the welfare of the greatest country upon earth and justice to one-half of its hundred millions of people.

Mr. MARTIN of Kentucky. Mr. President, the question under discussion has never been at issue in my State and as a consequence my information on its merits has been obtained mostly through the able debate of the subject on the floor of the Senate.

I have reached the conclusion that I should support the resolution on a ground entirely apart from consideration of the merits of the proposition to enfranchise the women. I am led to this conclusion because of the provision of Article V of the Constitution, to the effect that "the Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution," and so forth.

The question arises as to what are the conditions which should move the Congress to permit the people through the legislative bodies of the various States to consider a change in their organic law.

Certainly amendments might be proposed so frivolous in character or so contrary to the spirit of our institutions as to warrant a refusal upon the part of the Congress to even extend the opportunity for action by the States.

It can not be maintained, however, that this resolution before the Senate is either frivolous or offends the principles of our form of government.

The claim of the right of suffrage by thousands of patriotic and intelligent women, their insistent demand for it, the opinion of two-thirds of the Members of the House that they should have it, the advocacy of it by approximately 60 Members of this body, and the plea of the President that it should be granted as a war measure argue to my mind that the proposal is one of such grave moment as that the Senate should "deem it necessary" within the spirit of Article V to submit it to the States.

The debate on the floor of the Senate has been to me interesting and enlightening. I acknowledge the force of the strong reasoning of those who advocate the merits of suffrage on the ground that it is a right due the female sex, and a sentimental chord of my nature responds when I hear the plea of my colleagues, principally from the South, who are apprehensive that the exercise of the franchise by our women will result in depriving them of many of their womanly attributes, lessen their attractions, and place upon them a responsibility they do not wish. My own belief is that the transition of the women into a voting population would not create such a radical and revolutionary change as to work an upheaval of social conditions; likely their chief interest, as now, would still be in the home and home life; that active attention would not be given to matters political, except when social and moral life is directly affected by the questions that may be at issue.

The Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, upon the floor of the Senate yesterday, urged this measure as vital to the solution of the great problems which must be settled when the war is over, advocated it as a war measure, and asked that the executive tasks of this war resting on him be lightened by placing in his hands instruments which he is not now able to employ.

The President's deep concern about this question, his request for favorable action, and the strong and intelligent public opinion behind the measure persuade me that loyalty to our chieftain and fair consideration of the claim of right to have the States pass upon the subject demand that the people should be given the right to ratify or reject the proposal.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, for two days the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] constantly threw out suggestions to the Republican side of the Senate that so long as the Republicans furnished two-thirds of their membership in favor of this resolution it was in the interest of the Republican Party that the resolution be defeated, and carried with it the implied intimation that if there were any Republicans who were in doubt as to how they should vote upon this measure, Republicans who had not committed themselves in favor of it, it was to their political advantage to resolve that doubt against the measure and vote against it.

Mr. President, that intimation has had no effect upon this side of the aisle, but I am very sorry that it was made, because there should be no politics in the consideration of this question at this time.

Mr. President, what I shall have to say I do not suppose will have the slightest effect upon any Senator, so far as his vote is concerned. So far as the other side of the aisle is concerned, if the appeal of the distinguished leader of their party, the President of the United States, could not affect those who intended to vote against this measure, then no speech of any Senator, Republican or Democrat, could affect it.

But I do believe it proper, Mr. President, before the vote is taken that a statement of the exact situation should be made for the Record.

In the first place, upon the other side of the aisle those who vote against this measure do so upon one of two grounds, either that they are not willing to do everything to help win the war, or else they do not believe their leader, the President, when he says that the passage of this measure is necessary to help win the war. It is unthinkable that any Senator is not willing to do everything that he thinks is necessary to win the war. So it follows that every Democratic vote against this measure to-day will be because they do not believe the President of the United States when he solemnly tells them that the passage of this measure is necessary to help win the war.

But, Mr. President, there is another consideration to which I wish very briefly to refer. We constantly hear it said, and we shall hear it said more frequently between now and November, that the success of the Democratic Party is essential to the successful prosecution of the war. I hold in my hand a pamphlet bearing the imprint of the Democratic national committee, a pamphlet signed by W. D. Jamieson, assistant treasurer of the Democratic national committee, and I wish to quote from this pamphlet one paragraph, as follows:

The election of a Republican Congress in November would be viewed as a defeat for President Wilson by our allies, and particularly by our enemies. It would be viewed in Germany as a proof of their unwarranted claim that our country is not behind our war President. It would be a source of comfort and elation to the Kaiser and his cohorts.

Mr. President, I shall not at this time even attempt to characterize that statement as it ought to be characterized, to condemn that statement as it ought to be condemned and will be condemned throughout the United States by every loyal American, regardless of his political affiliations. I do not believe that that statement, coming from the Democratic national committee, finds indorsement upon the other side of the aisle. Democrats in the Senate know better than that; but, Mr. President, it is fair to assume that upon the Democratic side of the aisle those Members should feel that a continuance of Democratic control in the Senate and in the House would be better for the country in the prosecution of the war. That is a fair subject for debate; that is a subject that will be debated in the campaign that is soon to come upon us.

But, Mr. President, I want to call attention to the fact now that any Democrat who believes that the Democratic Party should succeed in the fall elections, if he does believe it, is in duty bound to vote for this joint resolution to-day. Why do I say that? The Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] the other day made the statement which I now quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

You, Senator SMOOT, pledged them 33 votes, so that they would induce the Democratic members of the committee to get this bill on the floor and you could kill it, and then you could make campaign material out of it in the Western States. You knew that through that action you could carry Montana and Colorado and that you could probably carry the Senate. You know that. You, from a suffrage State, know that if you kill this amendment by a Democratic vote, giving one-half of the two-thirds yourselves and one less than half of two-thirds on this side, you will sweep those States with the women's votes.

That is the statement of the Senator from Nevada, and there is no Senator who is better qualified to speak of conditions in those States or who knows them better than does the Senator from Nevada. He might have added—but I think he did not add through courtesy to his colleague—Nevada to the States of Montana and Colorado. I think the Senator from Nevada is mistaken, however, that the defeat of this amendment will in itself result in the sweeping of those States by the Republicans. Mr. President, the Republicans in the Senate will make their record and furnish more than the two-thirds vote that is necessary. In the House of Representatives, out of 214 Republicans, there were only 33 Republican votes against this joint resolution, while the Democrats furnished but a bare majority for it.

But, now, what I am coming to is this: Is there any Democratic Senator who believes sincerely that the success of the Democratic Party in November is essential to the most efficient prosecution of the war? If there is, how can that Democrat vote against this joint resolution in the face of the statement of the Senator from Nevada that the defeat of the resolution means a Republican Senate and a Republican House? Mr. President, any Democrat who votes against this joint resolution to-day estops himself during this campaign of asserting that Democratic success is necessary to the successful prosecution of the war, for he by his vote, according to the statement of one of his own colleagues, is doing more to injure the success of the Democratic Party than all of the speeches that he might make between now and November.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. LENROOT. I do.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I still believe that the defeat of this joint resolution, the Democrats failing to give one-half of two-thirds, is going very seriously to affect the Democratic vote in those States, because it is almost impossible for the condition to be realized. We might as well face it frankly. When I made that statement, however, it was in view of the fact that the women of those States, mind you, were not informed of the trickery attempted to be played to bring about that condition. In the present circumstances of the case, and under the evidence submitted by the Senator from Nevada, which stands undenied, I take it that the women of those States will visit upon the Republicans and upon the Democrats alike in this Chamber who vote against this measure the punishment which each and every one of them separately deserves.

Another thing: At the time those statements were made, not only was it in view of the trick that was attempted to be played, but at that time the President of the United States, who is to-day not only the head of this Nation but must remain the head of the Democratic Party, was being charged throughout the United States with treachery to woman suffrage, and the argument was made in support of that charge that he had never gone as far in the support of that war measure as he had in support of other war measures. The President of the United States has come before this body with a sincerity of purpose that not even his enemies will question, and I say to you now that the argument that I hoped would appeal to the Democrats on this side, and which the Senator from Wisconsin has now repeated, is not necessary, as it was before, because the President of the United States is the man who carries the responsibility to-day; and the President of the United States and the men of both parties who have proven their loyalty to him will be backed up by the women of the suffrage States and returned to the Senate and House of Representatives to uphold his hands and lighten his great burdens.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I said in the beginning of my remarks that the effect of the Senator's speech the other day was an implied invitation to the Republicans who might be in doubt to vote against the resolution. I am very sorry, indeed, to find that now not only the effect but the direct statement of the Senator from Nevada to his Democratic colleagues is that, while the other day he was pleading with them to vote for the resolution to promote Democratic success, he says to them to-day, "Gentlemen, it is not necessary for you now to vote for this resolution upon any such grounds." He says the President having set himself right with the women of the country, that now they can win these States whether this resolution shall pass or not.

Mr. President, I was trying in my feeble way to make an appeal to the other side of the aisle to get some votes for this resolution which it has not hitherto had; but now comes the champion of this resolution and destroys whatever effect my appeal might otherwise have had, and says to his colleagues that, so far as political considerations are concerned, it is not necessary for them to-day to vote for this resolution.

Mr. PITTMAN and Mr. SHAFROTH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. LENROOT. I yield first to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I did appeal on political grounds the other day to my colleagues on this side of the Chamber who are opposed to this resolution. My object in that appeal, as the Senator from Wisconsin discerned, was to get votes for this resolution. I appealed to them on the ground that we might lose the Senate; that the Republicans would be in an advantageous position if they could give us half of the necessary two-thirds, and could say "we did all that we could," and endeavor to incense women of the country because the Democrats did not give their half. I appealed to the Democrats on political grounds, but at the same time I attempted to expose the Republicans on the other side of the Chamber for the purpose of compelling them to keep their promise and give us 33 votes. You were going to give 33 votes, and you are still going to give 33 votes. The 33 votes the other day when I was talking would have carried this resolution; they will not carry it, possibly, now, since the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BENER] has declared his intention to vote against it. Now, be generous, and give us 34 votes. You can give us 40, if you want to do so; there is not the same obstacle, as you know, on your side that there is on this. I want to say to you if you will give us enough votes to carry this resolution, then you can claim all the credit you want, and I will give my word that never during the campaign will I say another word against the Republican Party

in connection with this amendment; but I thank God now that it is not necessary, so far as the western Senators are concerned, to appeal on political grounds to anybody on this side, and I have ceased to make such an appeal, for when the President of the United States comes before this body and states, with all the solemnness of his being, that he needs this power to win the war, no other argument is needed; and if that will not reach them, then the mere political argument that it is needed in the West will amount to nothing, and I will never use it again.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I did not intend to refer to the charge of trickery which the Senator from Nevada has so often made, because it has been apparent to every Senator in this Chamber that there was no foundation whatever for a charge of trickery. There was a mistake made; a mistake made in good faith on the Republican side, just exactly as it is now apparent that there was a mistake made in good faith on the Democratic side.

Mr. PITTMAN. But, Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield further to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. PITTMAN. The mistake made on the Republican side was a mistake that would bring this resolution before the body; that was the mistake. As I have heretofore said, the chairman of the committee was very anxious not to bring it up until he could be assured of carrying it. I think he is still of the same view, and I think the Senator from Wisconsin would like not to have had it voted on until it could carry.

Mr. LENROOT. Now, Mr. President, in reply to that, let us see what the situation would have been in regard to the charge of trickery upon the Republican side because there was one vote less than was expected on this side. Supposing that we had had that vote, in the matter of trickery we would have been in exactly the position to charge the other side with trickery after they had lost the one vote that they expected to have. We would not have done so, however.

Mr. PITTMAN. The answer to that is simply this: That the Republican caucus, in which the antis participated, had prior to all of this time unanimously, according to the statement of Senators on this floor, resolved that they intended to bring this resolution immediately before the Senate. The Democratic members of the Woman Suffrage Committee had not resolved to bring it before the Senate; they opposed bringing it before the Senate; they presented a united opposition to the Republican side; and I say to you they only brought it before the Senate by reason of information from the Republican side.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, the Senator may think he can make the country believe that it was in the power of the Republican side to bring this resolution before the Senate whenever it saw fit, but the Senator knows better than that; the Senator knows that, whatever attitude the Republican side might have, this resolution could not come before the Senate until the Democratic side was willing that it should come before the Senate.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, that is an incorrect statement, as I will show to the Senate. If the Republicans had unanimously voted to bring this resolution up at a time when it must have known that it would be defeated, I am perfectly confident that we would have had sufficient Democrats on this side who are not suffragists who would have joined in that unhappy solution by assisting you in defeating it.

Mr. LENROOT. Furthermore, Mr. President, the only effect of that Republican resolution was to serve notice upon the Democratic side and upon the country that the Republicans were ready to do their part in furnishing the two-thirds vote necessary and that the Republican side was ready to vote at any time when the Democratic side would do their part.

Mr. PITTMAN. And that they did not care whether it was won or defeated, so that they did their part; is that it? That is exactly what you meant.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, that is absolutely immaterial, because it has been within the power of the chairman of the committee to withdraw this resolution at any time; he could know exactly in what position it was before he called for a vote, and this unfinished business could have been displaced at any time upon the motion of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. President, just one word with reference to the charge of playing politics upon this side.

If politics were the sole consideration, if party advantage were the sole consideration upon the part of these Senators who are opposed to this joint resolution, of course we could furnish votes enough to pass it; but there is no such appeal upon this side of the aisle as there has been upon that side of the aisle. The appeal of your party leader necessarily, it would seem, should

be more influential upon that side of the aisle than this. Certainly, the appeal for party success which the Senator from Nevada made so strenuously the other day for his party would not appeal to this side of the aisle, because the Republican Party is willing to go before the country upon the record it has made in the support of the war, and appeal for success upon that ground. No one upon this side has made any such admission as the Senator from Nevada made the other day, that a particular vote upon a particular measure was essential for the success of his party.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. LENROOT. I yield.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Let me suggest to the Senator, as a compromise, that he deliver us as many votes as he can for the success of the Republican Party, and we will try to deliver as many votes upon this side of the Chamber for the success of the Democratic Party; and I hope you will get all of them on that side to enter into such an agreement, whether we get any more or not.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, the difference that exists is the constant claim made by the members of the Senator's party that the success of the Republican Party would give comfort to the Kaiser. You have never heard a Republican make any such claim with reference to the Democrats. You have heard no Republican make any assertion that Democratic success would be an aid to the Kaiser. The Republicans do believe, have believed, and will believe that Republican control of Senate and House will mean a more efficient prosecution of the war; but that is far from saying, as Democrats do, that Republican success will give comfort to the enemies of our country. If the Senator does not see the distinction, I think others do.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I am sorry that the Senator from Nevada has now given notice to his Democratic colleagues that it is immaterial, so far as party success is concerned, whether they vote this joint resolution up or vote it down. I am extremely sorry, for that reason, that I rose to speak at all, because if I had not perhaps that statement from the Senator from Nevada would not have been called out, and perhaps the statement which he made the other day, that it was necessary for party success, might have had some influence upon some of his colleagues upon that side of the aisle.

Mr. ASHURST. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GULON in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Henderson	New	Smith, Md.
Baird	Johnson, S. Dak.	Norris	Smith, Mich.
Bankhead	Jones, N. Mex.	Nugent	Smoot
Beckham	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Sterling
Benet	Kellogg	Owen	Sutherland
Borah	Kendrick	Page	Thompson
Brandegee	Kirby	Phenrose	Townsend
Calder	Knox	Phelan	Trammell
Culberson	La Follette	Pittman	Underwood
Cummins	Lenroot	Poindexter	Vardaman
Curtis	Lewis	Pomerene	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Lodge	Ransdell	Walsh
Drew	McCumber	Reed	Warren
Fernald	McKellar	Saulsbury	Watson
Fletcher	McLean	Shafroth	Weeks
France	McNary	Sheppard	Wilfley
Goff	Martin, Ky.	Shields	Williams
Gronna	Martin, Va.	Simmons	Wolcott
Gulon	Myers	Smith, Ariz.	
Hale	Nelson	Smith, Ga.	

Mr. LEWIS. I announce the absence of the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] because of illness, and that of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] because of official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, as it seems that we are about to begin voting on the various amendments that have been offered to the joint resolution, I want to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that this is a House joint resolution and that it was passed in the House of Representatives by exactly a two-thirds majority, there being not one vote to spare. I feel that no matter how meritorious any amendment may be its adoption would complicate the parliamentary situation and would require that the joint resolution be sent back to the House of Representatives. Consequently, those who are in favor of the measure really run the risk of perhaps losing it in the other House in the event that it has to go back to the House of Representatives to be voted upon.

We therefore feel that there ought to be no amendment made to this joint resolution, because it might jeopardize the chances of the passage of the joint resolution in the other House. In

other words, we think that no matter how meritorious a proposed amendment may be it ought not to be adopted and added to this joint resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, "mountains labor, and ridiculous mice are born." When I hear an argument from a Senator of the United States to the effect that "parliamentary complications" might intervene, and that therefore great public measures in the interest of the maintenance of the white man's social fabric in the cotton States of the United States should not be considered at all, and that on account of "parliamentary complications" every voice should be stilled, every aspiration of the white man in the cotton States for his family life and his civilization should be ignored, I confess I do not quite understand it. Parliamentary complications! A joint resolution with an amendment to go back to the other House to see whether or not the other House wants to adopt it, and a lot of speculative argument about whether the other House would or would not adopt it! That is all of his alleged argument.

I do not want the slightest misunderstanding of my position upon this question to go abroad. There is just one thing that I love better than the Democratic Party; there is just one thing that I love better than the United States; there is just one thing that I love better than I do my wife or my children or myself, and that is the hope of the purity and the integrity and the supremacy of the white race everywhere, but, so far as I am concerned, especially in my own native State.

When I think of the past, and the mistakes we have made, and the mistakes I have made, I feel a degree of intellectual humility that I can hardly express; but, notwithstanding all that, in some essential things we were right, and we are right now; and I can not for the life of me see why a Senator from the State of Colorado—bought with the money and the service and the blood of the South in gaining the Revolution and in fighting the Mexican War—merely bought territory with no original sovereignty of any sort—should rise and ignore as if it were hardly worth mentioning a proposition which I have made, which is not in limitation of the suffrage but which is in extension of the suffrage.

My amendment, when it is analyzed, means that we enfranchise every white woman in the United States, and that we do not enfranchise any Japanese, Chinese, or negro woman in the United States, but that we leave to each State the question as to whether or not it shall do that. If California wants to enfranchise the Chinese and Japanese women, let her do it; if Mississippi wants to enfranchise the negro women, let her do it; but do not force upon California and Mississippi the enfranchisement of those women who are not of our race, who are not of our aspirations, who are not of our ideals, who are not of anything that makes an essential part of us.

I can only repeat, as I have done I do not know how many times before this body and the body at the other wing of this Capitol, the old truism that a house divided against itself must fall. When you undertake to erect a structure of democracy, it must be founded upon the four pillars of justice, equality, fraternity, and liberty.

You can not have any real liberty unless you have real equality. You can not have any real equality—and I apologize for repeating this thought now, for it is about the eighth time I have done it—unless you have real fraternity, which means potential blood relationship in lawful marriage. You are not going to have it with Japanese and Chinese upon the Pacific coast and you are not going to have it with negroes in the Southern States. You can not have any fraternity unless you have real equality, and you can not have justice unless the superior race occupying a given territory is endowed with the right to prescribe the terms of justice. Just as long as you keep them menaced, just as long as you keep them frightened, just as long as you keep the women imagining that family life may be threatened, there will be no justice, because there will be no friendly feeling toward justice.

I am astonished at the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH]. I served with him for years in the Senate and the House. I am a Democrat and he is a Democrat. I am a Democrat not only by environment but by temperament. I am not only a Democrat with a big "D," but I am a democrat with a little bit of a "d." Among my friends I count ditch diggers and millionaires. I have never known, even by any inquiry of my own, how much money or how much birth any man has behind him. I have merely known the man. I am a democrat of the democrats with a little bit of a "d." I am almost a social democrat, in fact, in certain respects. But when the Senator comes to me and asks me to menace my wife and my daughters rather than to have a little "parliamentary complication," as he calls

it, I confess I am deaf and dumb to the appeal. I am only astonished at one thing.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Deaf but not dumb.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I can not help my deafness. I am not dumb, and if under the circumstances I had assumed to be dumb in order to please the Senator from New Mexico I would be false to Mississippi; I would have been false to her family life; I would have been false to the white man's civilization; I would have been false to Mississippi's traditions and her ideals.

I love the President of the United States personally better than any man on this floor, I expect. I would follow him in any real war measure, that I thought was a real war measure, to the limit. My boys are following him, my sons-in-law and nephews are following him, and I have been doing everything I knew how to help him. I would not put a feather's weight upon his shoulder to save my own life so far as his shoulders are bearing the burdens of this war. But when the President of the United States tells me that we can not whip Hindenburg, that we can not outmaneuver Ludendorff, that we can not scatter the Bulgarians, that we can not reconquer Palestine unless the negro women in the State of Mississippi can vote, I decline to agree with him, and I decline to agree with the Senator from New Mexico, who is here assuming to speak for him.

Now, I want a vote on this proposition, and I want a square, frank, honest vote. I want every man on the other side of the Chamber to express by his vote his real convictions, as I do want every man on this side to do it. I have seen in the last two days—never mind what I have seen; let it go—I have seen men trying to avoid a vote upon this proposition, men who want white civilization, white supremacy, and a homogeneous population, racially speaking, coming to me and begging that they may be relieved of the bitter dose of facing a yea-and-nay vote upon this question.

Do you think that you can make a great world power of America upon any other basis in the world except a white basis, a basis of white man's civilization, white man's traditions and ideals and code of ethics and family life? If you do, you have not sense enough to shake within the limits of a mustard shell. Nine out of ten of you agree with me and seven out of the nine have not the courage to face the chalk mark.

Now, Mr. President, one word more and I am done, and done for good. I leave the result in the lap of the gods; I care nothing about it. God will take care of the result. I take care of my conscience and my vote and my voice. Whatever happens in the long run, happens all right, because God rules this world.

Mr. President, the last word that I want to say is this: I belong to the old slave-holding class of the South. I never belonged to the nigger-hating and nigger-baiting class of the South. They were never composed of slaveholders. We took care of our darkies like they were members of our own family in a way, because in a sense they were. There are 50 or 75 I have upon my roll, and amongst them some of the most honest and true and loyal men and women I have ever known in my life, white or black. Nobody can make a nigger balter out of me; nobody can make a nigger hater out of me; and nobody in Mississippi can ever make out of me a man who gained, or would gain, office by "cussing" negroes. I not only have no hate for them; I have a positive gratitude to them. On a plantation with 150 negroes during the Civil War, only 6 left. How many Yankee raids there were I do not remember. Three of those six came back and said that they were impressed to drive teams.

One of them stayed out and was killed with Custer—out West, where Custer was killed—a very good boy. I have none of that general talk about race hatred and race prejudice, but I have got race knowledge, and I have race knowledge from a knowledge of both races under my own eyes. It is not a question of color. It is not a question of hair. It is a question of inward racial tendencies and traits.

I am not willing to cast this vote, even at the behest of the President of the United States, whom I love as if he were my only brother. I have only one brother, and he and I are closer kin than any two brothers in the world, so close that we meet to have business transactions only once in a year. He keeps my own private affairs and tells me how much I owe him or how much he owes me. I love the President of the United States with that sort of intense personal affection, but I can not see for the life of me what Ludendorff and Hindenburg and the Bulgarians and Turks in Macedonia and Palestine can have to do with the right of negro women to vote in the State of Mississippi.

Now, adopt my amendment and enfranchise the white women. Your wife and your daughter are just as fit to vote as you—racially, traditionally, ideally. Enfranchise them and mine. Then I will vote with you, and then you will accomplish a great

purpose, and you will save the Pacific slope from Oriental domination remotely, and you will save the South from any sort of domination except the white man's and woman's domination now and hereafter.

The Senator from Colorado tells me there are "parliamentary complications." That may be. The two Houses might spend a little time in conference debating whether or not they should enfranchise white women. I want to enfranchise white women, because I love them with all my soul. I started my life loving my mother, and I shall end it with loving my wife, and I shall end it by loving a lot of the sweetest daughters that you ever knew. Talk about "complications!" Why should you complicate this question of the white women's right to vote with the right of the Japanese, Chinese, and negroes to vote? By the way, Mr. President, I hope you heard me say negroes and not "niggers."

If I were taking care of my own darkies upon my own plantation, with no motive in the world except their interest, I would take the exact stand I am taking to-day, because I want to disarm the hostility of the white demagogues against the negro race; and the minute that the negroes are helpless and powerless to threaten white domination and white supremacy and the supremacy of the white man's civilization and family life these demagogues are disarmed. If I were a negro standing here to-day, I would take this position in behalf of the negroes of the States of South Carolina, Louisiana, Mississippi, Georgia, Alabama, Texas, and the balance of the cotton States where they form such a proportion of the population as to constitute a menace in the mind of the white man and woman, and therefore constitute a cause of hostility, and therefore constitute a pretext for demagogues to run for office on a pure negro question and nothing else.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, the suggestion which I made to the Senate in order to avoid further discussion upon this measure and to get it to a vote must have been a very important suggestion, for it seemed to raise a storm of indignation upon the part of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. The Senator from Mississippi is against this measure.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I beg the Senator's pardon. If the measure enfranchises the white women of the United States and does not enfranchise the negroes and Japanese and Chinese, I am for the measure.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will ask the Senator if the measure is not amended in any particular, will he vote for it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No.

Mr. SHAFROTH. That is what I thought.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course not.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, the Senator is against this measure. He knows, or he ought to know, that with his amendment and other amendments on the joint resolution there would not be a ghost of a show of ever having it ratified by three-fourths of the States of the Union.

The parliamentary situation to which I referred becomes an important factor in determining how friends of the measure should vote. As I suggested, no matter how important or how wise the amendment might be, the very fact that it is to be placed on the House joint resolution and the House in order to carry the measure must again vote in favor of its passage by a two-thirds majority shows the danger of the situation. Any amendment attached to it in the Senate would compel the joint resolution to go back to the House and run the hazard of the loss by one vote; and it seems to me that any friend of this measure would not put upon the joint resolution any amendment that would make it run that hazard of defeat.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President—

Mr. SHAFROTH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I do not like to have the statement of the Senator from Colorado go uncontradicted. The truth is—I am very sure I am right—that any amendment placed on the joint resolution requires a majority vote in the House of Representatives to pass it, and only a majority vote. The statement of the Senator from Colorado ought not to go unchallenged. While I do not sympathize with the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi and, of course, would not vote for it, it is not quite accurate to say that the loss of one vote from the vote as it passed in the House would defeat the joint resolution. If a conference is asked, the report could be adopted by a majority vote there, or it could here.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, that will have to be the case upon the final passage of the joint resolution in the House, and I can not agree with the position of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I am sorry the Senator can not agree with me. We have both served in the House, and I am

sure I have stated the rule correctly, and I favor the joint resolution.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I concede that here in the passage of this proposed amendment a majority vote can carry it and as to amending the joint resolution hereafter, but upon the final consummation of the passage of the measure we have got to have a two-thirds majority. That being the case, I can not see how by sending it over to the House it can maintain itself unless it has a two-thirds majority on final passage.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the Senator from Colorado really believe that extending the suffrage in the United States to his wife and daughters and sisters and mine and to the white women of the United States, and stopping it there, would weaken the vote of the white race, solely represented in both Houses of the National Legislature by men like him and me?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I believe in the extension of the franchise in every particular. I believe it is simply a question of giving—

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator does not answer my question.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do not know that I took it in. I was reading a note at the time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will ask it again.

Mr. SHAFROTH. All right.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the Senator really believe that with white men in the House and in the Senate a proposition for woman suffrage would be weakened in their minds by confining it to white women?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I say you can never pass the joint resolution by three-fourths of the States of the Union—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will ask the Senator—

Mr. SHAFROTH. I believe the placing of this amendment upon the joint resolution would absolutely prevent its adoption by three-fourths of the States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will ask the Senator this question, and then I will not worry him any further.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Very well; I am willing to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have known the Senator for a long time in the House and in the Senate. We have been friends, and very close friends.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Very close friends.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Would the fact that if white women alone were enfranchised weaken this amendment in the mind of the Senator from Colorado himself?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes; I believe that you could not get a measure of that kind through.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is not the question I asked the Senator. I asked whether in his opinion it would weaken it.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes; I think it would. I think we must recognize democracy. That is what you have got to do, and you must recognize it in everybody.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand the democracy of the Senator from Colorado consists in holding to the enfranchisement of women without regard to race or anything else?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I decline to yield.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I think the Senator ought to yield; there is no chance for a real disagreement on the rule.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do not think so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado declines to yield.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Very well; I will take my own time if the rule is raised.

Mr. SHAFROTH. All right; I am perfectly willing that the Senator should take all the time he cares to take.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I will not take the Senator's time; the danger is not that the House will not concur, but the States might refuse to ratify the resolution with the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi attached. This is the only real danger which I apprehend from amendments.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I am perfectly willing to yield, but let me get in one expression concerning this matter, and then the Senator may either ask me a question or he can take his own time in explaining the situation.

Mr. President, the situation is that bills and joint resolutions can be and are defeated continually, both in this body and in the House of Representatives, by the creation of parliamentary situations. They can be defeated by filibusters; they can be defeated in a number of other ways. We have a situation now where we have had this measure before the Senate for about a

year and one-half, and it has run the gantlet of parliamentary tactics to the present time.

If it were sent back to the House of Representatives, the chances are that that body would not consent to any amendment, because, knowing that amendment would not meet the favor of three-fourths of the States, they would say it would be a useless thing to pass the joint resolution after it was amended, for the very reason that it would be defeated. I have not any doubt that the Senator is earnest in this matter. I have not any doubt that he thinks civilization is at stake with relation to his home people. I do not think so.

But, Mr. President, three-fourths of the States have a right to determine that as well as the Senator has, and inasmuch as the Constitution has provided a method by which a constitutional amendment can be passed, it creates a test which has been made in the Constitution itself as to the wisdom of the measure. The Senator himself ought to concede that when three-fourths of the States say that the constitutional amendment is good he might be mistaken in his thought that it would be so detrimental to the people of his section.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEWIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to his colleague?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. I desire to ask my colleague whether at this hour, when thousands of both white men and black men under the colors of the United States are fighting the battle for democracy on the bloody fields of France, it is the appropriate time in the consideration of a great constitutional amendment to discriminate as we would discriminate if the amendment proposed by the senior Senator from Mississippi were adopted?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I thank my colleague for the suggestion. That was one of the reasons why I did not feel it was exactly the proper thing to enter into a discussion with relation to the merits of the amendment, and I rose solely for the purpose of expediting the votes that are to be taken upon amendments to the joint resolution.

Mr. President, as I was saying, parliamentary tactics often defeat a measure. You can load a bill with so many amendments that even if they are good amendments you will find people will differ with relation to them, and consequently the bill might be lost. That is done even in ordinary legislation. That can be done even in the passage of bills; but when you add to that the fact that this joint resolution not only would have to go to the House of Representatives again but would have to go to all the States, with the danger that 12 States in the Union might defeat it, it would be almost criminal, it seems to me, to couple with this joint resolution an amendment that might make the measure disputable as to its merits. We have three amendments here. Suppose you were to put all three of them on the joint resolution, would there be a chance on earth of having the joint resolution passed by three-fourths of the States?

That is one of the methods of defeating a measure. One of the ways is to load it up so that somebody will object to it. That is the method which can be invoked in behalf of some of those who are directly opposed, for the purpose of getting aid in some other direction, to a limited extent, and then the joint resolution will fail.

Mr. President, I have called attention to this matter, because I think it is paramount at this time with relation to the success of this vote. That being the case I hope that we can proceed to vote.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, I have already addressed the Senate upon this question, but I desire at this point to correct what possibly is an erroneous impression created by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] that the wives of Japanese or Chinese are in any way affected by this amendment. The Chinese and Japanese under our naturalization laws are ineligible to citizenship. The naturalization laws provide for the naturalization only of persons of the white race. Therefore, their fortunes are not at all involved in this amendment.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I am sure we have all been impressed by the earnestness of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] in discussing his amendment. I know that he feels that he has touched upon a very important subject, and I would not undertake in any way to treat with levity any proposition which he might advance. On yesterday I listened with great interest to an able speech by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] discussing an amendment which he has offered. I know that he feels that he has presented a thought that is worthy of the serious consideration of the Senate. These are subjects which at the proper time or on some proper occasion might be discussed by the various Senators who entertain divergent views regarding them.

But I want to make one statement, and that is that this proposed amendment to the Constitution as it comes to us from the other House is in the same form which it had when it was presented to Congress many decades ago. It has become sanctified by age. The people of the United States, the women and the men who have been discussing this tremendous question, have framed their arguments around the joint resolution as it comes to us from the House; and I know, Mr. President, that if any amendment were put upon the joint resolution it would be a decided disappointment to the millions of men and women of this country who give to this resolution their hearty support. So, with all due deference to Senators who have proposed amendments, I can only request that such amendments be laid aside for future consideration, should the Congress of the United States deem the time opportune. Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion before the Senate is that of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES], that the proposed amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] be laid upon the table.

Mr. REED. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. I simply want to get every Senator here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Guion	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ga.
Baird	Hale	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Bankhead	Hardwick	New	Smith, Mich.
Beckham	Henderson	Norris	Smith, S. C.
Benet	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nugent	Smoot
Brandegee	Jones, N. Mex.	Overman	Sterling
Calder	Jones, Wash.	Page	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Kellogg	Penrose	Thomas
Colt	Kendrick	Phelan	Thompson
Cummins	Kenyon	Pittman	Townsend
Curtis	Kirby	Poindexter	Trammell
Dillingham	Knox	Pomerene	Underwood
Drew	La Follette	Ransdell	Vardaman
Fernald	Lenroot	Reed	Wadsworth
France	Lewis	Robinson	Warren
Fletcher	Lodge	Shafroth	Watson
Gerry	McKellar	Sheppard	Weeks
Goff	McLean	Shields	Willfley
Gore	McNary	Simmons	Williams
Gronna	Martin, Ky.	Smith, Ariz.	Wolcott

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair begs to announce the absence of the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], on account of illness.

Eighty Senators having responded to their names, there is a quorum present. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. The yeas and nays having been ordered on the motion, the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WALSH (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], who, I notice, is not in the Chamber. I am advised, however, that if he were present the Senator from New Jersey would vote as I propose to do, and I accordingly vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WILFLEY (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], who is not here. If I were allowed to vote, I should vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BECKHAM. I have a pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. THOMPSON (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a pair with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN], but I have an understanding with him that either of us may vote on this proposition. The Senator from Illinois, if present, would vote as I do; so I will let my vote stand.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I desire to say that my colleague [Mr. SWANSON] is detained from the Senate by serious illness in his family. If he were present, my colleague would vote "nay."

Mr. BRANDEGEE (after having voted in the negative). I have voted under the impression that the question was on the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi, but now understanding that the motion is to lay his amendment on the table, I change my vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. WATSON (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT]. I now discover that he did not vote. I therefore

transfer my pair with him to the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], and will permit my vote to stand.

Mr. COLT (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY], but I am at liberty to vote on the amendment. I will, therefore, allow my vote to stand.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the absence of the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] on the liberty-loan campaign. Were he present, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 22, as follows:

YEAS—61.

Ashurst	Henderson	McNary	Smith, Ariz.
Baird	Hitchcock	Nelson	Smith, Mich.
Brandegee	Johnson, S. Dak.	New	Smoot
Calder	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Sterling
Chamberlain	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Sutherland
Colt	Kellogg	Owen	Thomas
Cummins	Kendrick	Page	Thompson
Curtis	Kenyon	Penrose	Townsend
Dillingham	Kirby	Phelan	Wadsworth
Drew	Knox	Pittman	Walsh
Fernald	La Follette	Poindexter	Warren
France	Lenroot	Pomerene	Watson
Gerry	Lewis	Ransdell	Weeks
Goff	Lodge	Robinson	
Gronna	McCumber	Shafroth	
Hale	McLean	Sheppard	

NAYS—22.

Bankhead	Hardwick	Reed	Trammell
Benet	McKellar	Shields	Underwood
Borah	Martin, Ky.	Simmons	Vardaman
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ga.	Williams
Gore	Myers	Smith, Md.	
Gulon	Overman	Smith, S. C.	

NOT VOTING—13.

Beckham	Harding	Saulsbury	Wolcott
Culberson	Hollis	Sherman	
Fall	Johnson, Cal.	Swanson	
Frelinghuysen	King	Willey	

So the amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS was laid on the table.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] I present the amendment I send to the desk, and I should like at the same time to ask for a yeas-and-nays vote upon it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah, in behalf of the Senator from New Jersey, presents an amendment, which will be read by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the joint resolution, after the word "sex," it is proposed to insert the following:

but no male person who is not a citizen of the United States shall exercise the right of suffrage at an election for Senators and Representatives in Congress or for electors for President and Vice President of the United States, and no female person who is not such a citizen otherwise than by marriage, or who, having acquired citizenship by marriage, has not complied with such requirements and conditions as may be prescribed by the Congress, shall exercise such right.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I believe that all Senators present understand that there are substantial reasons why no amendment is desired. The reasons have been given at considerable length, and I therefore move that this amendment—

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator withhold his motion for a moment, because I wish to make a statement?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Very well.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am in full accord with the statement just made by the Senator from New Mexico. I shall vote against the amendment if it is voted on directly; and if the vote comes on a motion to lay it on the table I shall vote in favor of that motion.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. Why can we not have a vote direct on the amendment? We can take it quite as quickly as on a motion to lay on the table.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I will say to the Senator that I do not want to show any partiality. I moved to lay the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] on the table, and would really prefer that the same action be taken regarding the amendment now offered.

Mr. CALDER. Will the Senator from New Mexico withhold his motion for a moment?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I have not made the motion as yet, and I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I am opposed—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has the floor by the consent of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. If the Senator from New York desires to address the Senate, I will yield the floor for that purpose.

Mr. CALDER. I should like to occupy the floor for a moment or two.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish to ask the Senator from New Mexico a question. Why did he move to lay my amendment on the table and not move to lay the amendment just offered on the table?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I have just stated, if the Senator will pardon me, that I intended to move to lay the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah for the Senator from New Jersey on the table.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Ah, I understand; the Senator has just yielded to allow the Senator from New York to make a few remarks of a desultory and unnecessary character on his proposition. Why did the Senator from New Mexico come to that determination?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has recognized the Senator from New York.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. With all deference to the Senator from Mississippi, I think he had an opportunity to make some remarks.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, yes; before the Senator made the motion to lay my amendment on the table.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. And every Senator had an opportunity to discuss it.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order being demanded by the Senator from Connecticut, the Chair will have to hold, the Senator from New Mexico having yielded to the Senator from New York, and the Senator from New York having been recognized by the Chair, that the Senator from New York has the floor.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I am sure the Senator from New York will yield to me in order that I may put myself right with the Senator from Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. CALDER. I do, with pleasure.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I submit to the Senator from Mississippi that every Senator present who desired to discuss the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi had an opportunity to do so before I made the motion to lay the amendment on the table; and I am only according a like privilege to the Senator from New York and to any other Senator regarding the amendment now pending. I am sure the Senator from Mississippi will not feel that I have been at all partial as against him. The Senator from Mississippi knows that if there is any Senator in the Chamber to whom I would extend deference it is the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I knew that, and I knew, as a matter of personal friendship between the Senator from New Mexico and me, that everything was all right; but I just wanted to indicate to the galleries, who seem to be present in considerable number to-day and who seem to be very influential in controlling Senators' votes, that there were discriminations against Senators from the South as compared with Senators from the North, in that the Senator from New Mexico made a motion to lay my amendment upon the table, thereby cutting off further debate, while he had refrained from making a similar motion with regard to the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey, who is a very much more important democratic factor, spelled with a little "d," than I.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. If I had known that the Senator from Mississippi desired to speak, I should have withheld my previous motion, as I will withhold my motion in this instance, so as to give the Senator from New York an opportunity to discuss the pending amendment.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I am opposed to the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], first, for the reason given by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES]. I do not think it wise to imperil the passage of the suffrage amendment by attaching to it any amendment of this character. Secondly, I oppose it for the reason given by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] yesterday, when he stated that this matter could be amply provided for by legislation. Thirdly, and perhaps most important, I am opposed to it because we have in this country to-day 5,800,000 white women of foreign birth, many of whom are now voting, and all of whom would be disfranchised by this provision, although married to citizens of the United States. I have in mind a woman who came to this country from Europe when she was 1 year of age, who has lived here for seventy odd years, who was educated here, and who is the mother of children born in this country. Under the terms of the amendment now pending she would be disfranchised. I think the amendment is a very unwise one, and hope it will be defeated.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, I shall not occupy the floor more than seven minutes, and I do that only because of the appeal which was addressed to me in common with my colleagues by the Chief Executive on yesterday.

I have voted for every real or alleged war measure since the war began, and I have done so because I believed that those measures were wise and reasonable under all the circumstances. I deeply regret, therefore, that I can not respond favorably to the appeal made by the Chief Executive; but I can not do so, because the more I have thought and the more I have heard upon this matter the firmer has become my conviction that this resolution, if adopted, will impose upon the women of America war responsibilities which they neither desire nor anticipate.

Discouraging and depressing as it is to them and to all of us, we must all admit that to-day force, physical force, physical force without stint, still remains the ultimate defender of all we hold most sacred. We must see to-day that the bayonet is all that stands between us and unspeakable disaster. Mr. President, it is not the fault of the mothers that they are not as well fitted by nature to use the bayonet as are their sons. I think it is to the credit of the sons that, so far in the history of this Republic, they have never declined to use the bayonet in the defense of their mothers, and it is unthinkable to me that they will not in the future, as they have in the past, defend their mothers in peace as well as in war, with the ballot as well as with the bayonet.

It is my opinion that there is no one within the sound of my voice who believes that the time will ever come when a majority of the men in any legislative assembly in this country will cease to love and cherish and defend their mothers. Nevertheless, Mr. President, and unnecessary as it seems to me to be, I would be willing to support a measure that would confer upon the women the burden of the ballot upon all matters where their responsibility is coextensive with that of men. I say "the burden of the ballot"; I call it a burden. It may be a right, it may be a privilege, but it is always a grave responsibility, and one which I sincerely hope will not prove to be too heavy for mortals to bear.

The women should have the right and the duty to vote upon all questions affecting the education of their children. This has been for many years the law in the State which I have the honor in part to represent, and it may be fair for me to state here that the women of Connecticut have substantially ignored that duty. The laws of my State give every preference to the wife, and they carefully guard every property interest of the women. This is as it should be; but this joint resolution goes beyond that. This joint resolution goes beyond the seas and above the clouds. It attempts to tamper with the ballot box, over which mother nature always has had and always will have supreme control; and such attempts always have ended and always will end in failure and misfortune.

We have had a recent demonstration of the accuracy of this statement, and I am surprised that the President of the United States seems to have forgotten it. He may have been disappointed, but I was pleased and reassured in April, 1917, when I read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that the woman Representative in this Congress, when subjected to the "acid test," had proved herself to be just what God made her—a womanly woman under all circumstances—and I was reassured and pleased when I was told by one of the leaders in the suffrage movement in my State that had she been a Member of Congress in April, 1917, she would have voted as Miss RANKIN did, against war, although she believed in a vigorous prosecution of the war once it had been declared.

I was again pleased and reassured when, upon inquiry, I found that she fairly represented her sex. I should despair of the future if such were not the case. Mr. President, I dare not think of what would have happened to all of us if in April, 1917, the balance of power in the American Congress had been in the hands of those so constituted physically and spiritually that they could not vote for war under any circumstances, and I shudder when I think of what will happen to this country in the future when such conditions prevail.

So, Mr. President, it is my belief that until wars and rumors of wars shall cease justice, simple justice, to the women of this country demands that all questions involving declarations of war and terms of peace should be left to that sex which must do the fighting and the dying on the battle field. It may be that the Almighty made a mistake when He gave superior strength to the male; but if He did, I do not believe that this Congress or the Chief Executive can remedy it.

That is all I care to say upon this subject, Mr. President. Of course, the women have done a noble work and made every sacrifice required. There is nothing in language that can adequately measure the value of their services in this war,

But, Mr. President, if the responsibility of the franchise is to be extended or limited, those of us above the fighting age should be denied the ballot, and it should be given to the boys between 18 and 21 who have just been called to the colors; but they are not asking it, and they will not ask it unless they fear that their representatives in the American Congress will accept less than unconditional surrender from our foe, and until they ask it it is my belief that their mothers should be and remain both proud and content.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, two minutes is all that I desire.

The civilized world to-day is following two great leaders in statecraft, believing in them, trusting in them. One is the President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson; the other is Lloyd-George, the premier of Great Britain. The President has spoken to the Senate on this great question. I think it is altogether fitting to place as a companion piece to his remarks the letter of Lloyd-George to the Interallied Women's Congress in Paris, held in August last, and I therefore ask that the Secretary read the letter, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

WOMEN OF ENGLAND HAVE SAVED THE ALLIED CAUSE, LLOYD-GEORGE TELLS WOMEN'S CONGRESS IN PARIS.

PARIS, August 21.

Premier Lloyd-George sent this letter to the Interallied Women's Congress:

"I am anxious to bear testimony to the tremendous part played by the women of England in this vital epoch of human history. They have not only borne their burden of sorrow and separation with unflinching fortitude and patience, but they have assumed an enormous share of the burdens necessary to the practical conduct of the war.

"If it had not been for the splendid manner in which the women came forward to work in the hospitals and munition factories, in administrative offices of all kinds, and in war work behind the lines, often in daily danger of their lives, Great Britain and, I believe, all the allies would have been unable to withstand the enemy attacks of the last few months. For this service to our common cause humanity owes them unbounded gratitude.

"In the past I have heard it said that women were unfit to vote because they would be weak when it came to understanding the issues and bearing the strains of a great war. My experience in South Wales last week is what has confirmed me in the belief that the women there understand perfectly what is at stake in this war. I believe they recognize as clearly as any that there can be no peace, progress, or happiness in the world so long as the monster of militarism is able to stalk unbridled and unashamed among the weaker peoples.

"To them this war is a crusade of righteousness and gentleness, and they do not mean to make peace until the allies have made it impossible for another carnival of violence to befall mankind. I am certain that this resolution of the women of South Wales is but typical of the spirit of the women of the rest of Great Britain.

"This war began in order that force and brutality might crush out freedom among men. Its authors can not have foreseen that one of its main effects would be to give women a commanding position and influence in the public affairs of the world. To their ennobling influence we look not only for strength to win the war, but for inspiration during the great work of reconstruction we will have to undertake after victory is won.

"The women who have been flocking to France to work for the allies are among the foremost leaders in this great movement of regeneration. My message to their representatives gathered in Paris is this: 'Well done. Carry on. You are helping to create a new earth for yourselves and your children.'

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I favor the object sought to be accomplished by the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN]. I think that unnaturalized aliens ought to be disfranchised. I think that citizenship of the United States ought to be made a prerequisite to voting, not only for Senators and Representatives in Congress, but for electors for President and Vice President of the United States. If the several States will not disfranchise unnaturalized aliens, then I think the Congress and three-fourths of the States, in accordance with the Constitution, ought to take that necessary step—a step to safeguard the elections in this country.

Some seven or eight States to-day permit unnaturalized aliens to vote under certain conditions and limitations. Several of these States are pivotal States. It might happen that a sufficient number of unnaturalized aliens would vote in these States to constitute the controlling factor in electing a sufficient number of Senators and Representatives to constitute the controlling factors in the two Houses. It might be that unnaturalized aliens in these States would constitute the controlling factor in electing a sufficient number of presidential electors to constitute the controlling factor in the electoral college. I say that may happen. Of course, it may be answered that it has not happened and will not happen; but, sir, the possibility of such an occurrence ought to be prevented.

I have offered an amendment substantially the same as that presented by the Senator from New Jersey. I send it to the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma tenders an amendment, which will now be read by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. At the end of line 11 it is proposed to add the following:

No person other than a citizen of the United States shall be entitled to vote for Senators and Representatives in Congress or for electors for President and Vice President of the United States.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, if this amendment or the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey were agreed to, it would not disfranchise, as I understand, the women described by the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER]. It would permit citizens of the United States, native-born or naturalized citizens, to vote. The women described by him are naturalized citizens of the United States, as I understand. There are different methods of naturalization. A person can become a citizen of the United States in only two ways—either by birth or by naturalization—and every person who is a citizen of the United States has acquired that character in one or the other of these two ways.

Mr. President, while I had given notice of my intention to present this amendment, I have decided not to offer it and not to press it upon the consideration of the Senate at this time. I have two reasons for this conclusion. First, I do not desire to encumber the pending joint resolution. In the second place, I have assurances coming from members of the Judiciary Committee on the part of Senators who are much interested in the pending joint resolution, that they will take up the joint resolution which I have offered and undertake to report it, or some similar resolution, to the Senate. At some future time this measure can be considered upon its own merits. I trust that it will be reported at an early date, that it will be submitted to the States by the Congress, and will be ratified by the required number of States.

While I can not vote to table the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey, I was not willing to take the responsibility of pressing such an amendment upon the consideration of the Senate at this time.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I move that the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey be laid upon the table.

Mr. LODGE. Upon that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi makes a parliamentary inquiry. The Senator will state it.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I should like to know if the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] was an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator that it was not, as the Chair is informed. The Senator from New Mexico moves that the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey be laid upon the table, upon which motion the Senator from Massachusetts asks for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BECKHAM (when his name was called). Announcing again my pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS], I withhold my vote.

Mr. THOMPSON (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. WALSH (when his name was called). As announced before, I have a general pair with the mover of the amendment [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN]. I transfer the pair to the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] and vote "yea."

Mr. WATSON (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as on the last roll call, I vote "nay."

Mr. WILFLEY (when his name was called). Again announcing my pair with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I again announce that my colleague [Mr. SWANSON] is detained from the Senate by serious illness in his family. If he were present, he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—50.

Ashurst	Hitchcock	Myers	Smith, Ariz.
Calder	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nelson	Smith, Mich.
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Smoot
Colt	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Sterling
Culberson	Kellogg	Owen	Sutherland
Cummins	Kendrick	Page	Thomas
Curtis	Kenyon	Phelan	Thompson
Fernald	Kirby	Pittman	Walsh
France	La Follette	Poindexter	Warren
Gerry	Lenroot	Ransdell	Weeks
Goff	Lewis	Robinson	Williams
Gronna	McKellar	Shafroth	
Henderson	McNary	Sheppard	

NAYS—33.

Baird	Dillingham	Hale	McLean
Bankhead	Drew	Hardwick	Martin, Va.
Benet	Fletcher	Knox	New
Borah	Gore	Lodge	Overman
Brandegee	Guion	McCumber	Penrose

Pomerene	Smith, Ga.	Townsend	Vardaman
Reed	Smith, Md.	Trammell	Wadsworth
Shields	Smith, S. C.	Underwood	Watson
Simmons			

NOT VOTING—13.

Beckham	Hollis	Martin, Ky.	Swanson
Fall	Johnson, Cal.	Saulsbury	Wilfley
Frelinghuysen	King	Sherman	Wolcott
Harding			

So Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN's amendment was laid on the table.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I move to amend by striking out, in line 11, page 1, the words "or by any State," so that if amended the amendment would read:

SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States on account of sex.

I have already made some allusion to the purpose of that amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. I call for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida having made the motion heard by the Senate, the Senator from New Mexico is recognized, but the Chair desires to say to the Senator from New Mexico that there has been a request for the yeas and nays.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I have no objection to that. I desire to make motions similar to those I have previously made regarding the other amendments. I move to lay this amendment upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico moves to lay the amendment of the Senator from Florida upon the table.

Mr. FLETCHER. I ask for the yeas and nays on that motion. The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I ask that the Secretary state the amendment. Some Senators do not seem to understand it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Florida will be stated by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. On line 11 of the amendment it is proposed to strike out the words "or by any State," so that if amended the section will read:

SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States on account of sex.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment as read the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] moves to lay upon the table. The yeas and nays were requested, and a sufficient number having seconded, a roll call will be had.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BECKHAM (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS]. In his absence, I withhold my vote.

Mr. WALSH (when his name was called). I am informed that my pair, if present, would vote in the affirmative, and I shall vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WILFLEY (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON]. In his absence, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. SWANSON] if present would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 65, nays 17, as follows:

YEAS—65.

Ashurst	Hale	McLean	Sheppard
Baird	Henderson	McNary	Smith, Ariz.
Brandeggee	Hitchcock	Myers	Smith, Mich.
Calder	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nelson	Smoot
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	New	Sterling
Colt	Jones, Wash.	Norris	Sutherland
Culberson	Kellogg	Nugent	Thomas
Cummins	Kendrick	Owen	Thompson
Curtis	Kenyon	Page	Townsend
Dillingham	Kirby	Penrose	Vardaman
Drew	Knox	Phelan	Wadsworth
Fernald	La Follette	Pittman	Walsh
France	Lenroot	Poindexter	Warren
Gerry	Lewis	Pomerene	Watson
Goff	Lodge	Ransdell	
Gore	McCumber	Robinson	
Gronna	McKellar	Shafroth	

NAYS—17.

Bankhead	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ga.	Williams
Benet	Overman	Smith, Md.	Wolcott
Fletcher	Reed	Smith, S. C.	
Gulon	Shields	Trammell	
Hardwick	Simmons	Underwood	

NOT VOTING—14.

Beckham	Harding	Martin, Ky.	Weeks
Borah	Hollis	Saulsbury	Wilfley
Fall	Johnson, Cal.	Sherman	
Frelinghuysen	King	Swanson	

So Mr. FLETCHER's amendment was laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will ascertain if there be other amendments pending not disposed of. [After a pause.] The joint resolution is as in Committee of the Whole and is still open to amendment. If there be no further amendment, it will be reported to the Senate.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BECKHAM (when his name was called). On this vote I am paired with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS] and the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN]. They are both absent, and I understand that if present would vote "yea." If at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." In their absence, I withhold my vote.

Mr. BORAH (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING]. If those Senators were present, they would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. CURTIS (when Mr. HARDING's name was called). I was requested by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] to announce that because of the action of the Republican State convention of Ohio, were he present he would vote "yea."

Mr. KENDRICK (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL], who is unavoidably absent. I am informed that if he were present he would vote "yea." I therefore feel at liberty to vote, and I vote "yea."

Mr. KNOX (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] and the junior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON]. Those two Senators, if voting, would vote "yea." If I were voting, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote under the circumstances.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia (when Mr. SWANSON's name was called). My colleague [Mr. SWANSON] is detained from the Senate by illness in his family. If he were present and at liberty to vote, he would vote "nay." He is paired on this vote with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. WILFLEY] and the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING].

Mr. TOWNSEND (when his name was called). As has been stated by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX], the junior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and I are paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX], but I transfer my pair to the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN], who, if present, would vote "yea." He is detained, being a member of the committee of the Federal Reserve Board in Chicago, and is out on a liberty-loan campaign. I vote "yea."

Mr. WILFLEY (when his name was called). As has been announced by the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN], I am paired with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], who is absent on account of illness in his family. If he were present, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico (after having voted in the affirmative). I desire to change my vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—53.

Ashurst	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nelson	Smith, Mich.
Calder	Jones, Wash.	New	Smoot
Chamberlain	Kellogg	Norris	Sterling
Colt	Kendrick	Nugent	Sutherland
Culberson	Kenyon	Owen	Thomas
Cummins	Kirby	Page	Thompson
Curtis	La Follette	Phelan	Townsend
Fernald	Lenroot	Pittman	Vardaman
France	Lewis	Poindexter	Walsh
Gerry	McCumber	Ransdell	Warren
Goff	McKellar	Robinson	Watson
Gore	McNary	Shafroth	
Gronna	Martin, Ky.	Sheppard	
Henderson	Myers	Smith, Ariz.	

NAYS—31.

Baird	Hale	Penrose	Smith, S. C.
Bankhead	Hardwick	Pomerene	Trammell
Benet	Hitchcock	Reed	Underwood
Brandeggee	Jones, N. Mex.	Saulsbury	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Lodge	Shields	Weeks
Drew	McLean	Simmons	Williams
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ga.	Wolcott
Gulon	Overman	Smith, Md.	

NOT VOTING—12.

Beckham	Frelinghuysen	Johnson, Cal.	Sherman
Borah	Harding	King	Swanson
Fall	Hollis	Knox	Wilfley

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not having a sufficient two-thirds majority, the joint resolution does not pass.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on the next legislative day of the Senate I shall move to reconsider the vote which has just been taken.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico subsequently said: It has been suggested to me by some Senators that in giving notice I would move to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed I should state that I did not mean to intimate that I expected to call for another vote within the near future. My purpose is to permit the motion to reconsider to remain on the calendar, so that it may be taken up later on should there be a change in the Senate between now and the 4th of next March. I desire to announce, however, that no action will be taken without due notice to all Senators.

Mr. REED. Four or five days' notice?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Certainly; there will be ample notice of a vote.

STIMULATION OF AGRICULTURE—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses upon the bill (H. R. 11945) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the purposes of the act entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense by stimulating agriculture and facilitating the distribution of agricultural products."

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I object to the consideration of the conference report to-day. The Senator from North Carolina says to me that the conference report is very important. That is very true, but the distinguished conferees have omitted a very important part of their duty. They have left out amendment No. 29, which the Senate unanimously put on, and I hardly think the conference report will be agreed to to-day under that situation of affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona object to the consideration of the report?

Mr. GORE. It does not require unanimous consent. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the report.

Mr. ASHURST. That motion can not be made under the rule on the same day the report is presented.

Mr. GORE. The Senator is mistaken. That rule does not apply to a conference report.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I know the Senator has a perfect right to move to proceed to the consideration of the conference report under the rule, but the bill has been in the Senate or the House or in conference for months. It is a very important measure. The conference report has not been printed. I ask the Senator from Oklahoma not to press it to a vote at this time. Let the conference report be printed, and then we will see just what the conferees have agreed to.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, in response to the suggestion of the Senator from Utah, I will state my reason for asking for the present consideration of the conference report. The other House lost a quorum on Saturday last. They succeeded yesterday in obtaining, I understand, a bare quorum. It is feared that they will lose a quorum and that it will not be possible for them to act on the conference report unless they receive it at an early day. I am also informed that the chairman of the House committee had a death in his family that requires his absence from the city. I have no desire from any other consideration than that to press this matter upon the Senate. If there be any question which I can answer and clear up any misunderstanding or any doubt touching the conference report, I shall be very glad to do it. Of course if we can not reach a decision to-day and Senators insist on its going over, I realize that they really have a right to have the report printed before it is considered; but I am very anxious to have it considered while the House is in a situation to act upon it.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 10 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, October 3, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Nominations received by the Senate October 1 (legislative day of September 30), 1918.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE.

George W. Anderson, of Boston, Mass., to be United States circuit judge, first circuit, vice Frederic Dodge, resigned.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Edwin G. Moon, of Ottumwa, Iowa, to be United States attorney, southern district of Iowa, vice Claude R. Porter, resigned.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Cooper Stout, of Danville, Ill., to be United States marshal, eastern district of Illinois.

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY DURING THE EXISTENCE OF THE PRESENT EMERGENCY.

Col. Samuel McRoberts to be brigadier general, Ordnance Department, with rank from August 8, 1918.

PROVISIONAL APPOINTMENTS, BY PROMOTION, IN THE ARMY.

INFANTRY.

Second Lieut. Evan C. Williams to be first lieutenant with rank from February 9, 1918.

Second Lieut. Joel A. Fite to be first lieutenant with rank from November 29, 1917.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 1 (legislative day of September 30), 1918.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Alfred W. Brown, jr., to be a lieutenant commander. The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants:

Edward K. Lang,
Robert Gatewood,
John A. Fletcher,
Daniel J. Callaghan,
Richard S. Field,
George D. Murray,
Howard H. Good,
Herman E. Fischer,
Warren A. Shaw,
Anton B. Anderson,
Elliott Buckmaster,
Ralph W. Holt, and
William G. Greenman.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade):
Winfred H. A. Pike, jr.,
John F. Bates, jr.,
Harry H. Chenoweth,
Stuart B. Clark,
Herbert V. Wiley,
Glenn H. Easton,
Robert T. Darrow,
Alan Barnet,
Elmer R. Henning,
James E. Maher,
Allen G. Quynn,
Archer E. King, jr.,
Preston Marshall,
Hilbert A. Fisher, and
John S. Ray.

Midshipman Chauncey Camp to be an ensign. The following-named assistant surgeons to be passed assistant surgeons with the rank of lieutenant:

Charles E. Trebly,
Roscoe M. Waterhouse,
Chalmer H. Weaver, and
Henry McDonald.

Dental Surg. William N. Cogan to be an assistant dental surgeon with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade).

The following-named dental surgeons to be assistant dental surgeons with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade):

Harry E. Harvey,
James L. Brown,
Eugene H. Tennent,
Joseph A. Mahoney,
Leon Martin,
Joseph D. Halleck, and
Anson F. McCreary.

Dental Surg. John W. Crandall to be an assistant dental surgeon with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade).

The following-named dental surgeons to be assistant dental surgeons with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade):

Marion E. Harrison,
Ernest W. Lacy,
Lucian C. Williams,
Harry W. Blaisdell, and
Harry D. Johnson.

Dental Surg. Paul G. White to be an assistant dental surgeon with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade).

The following-named dental surgeons to be assistant dental surgeons with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade):

Cornelius H. Mack,
Arthur A. Rehm,
Hugh T. Meyers,
William L. Darnall,
Logan A. Willard,
John R. Barber,
George H. Reed,
Franklin L. Morey,
John V. McAlpin,
Marson W. Mangold,
Edward E. Harris,
Thomas L. Sampson, and
Thomas J. Daly, jr.

The following-named dental surgeons to be passed dental surgeons with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade):

Alexander G. Lyle and
Alexander J. Zuehlke.

Asst. Dental Surg. William N. Cogan to be a passed assistant dental surgeon with the rank of lieutenant.

The following-named assistant dental surgeons to be passed assistant dental surgeons with the rank of lieutenant:

Harry E. Harvey,
James L. Brown,
Eugene H. Tennent,
Joseph A. Mahoney,
Leon Martin, and
Anson McCreary.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Robert S. Robertson, jr., to be a lieutenant on the retired list.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Michael A. Leahy to be a lieutenant on the retired list.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Richard E. Byrd, jr., to be a lieutenant on the retired list.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Walter L. Heiberg to be a lieutenant on the retired list.

Pay Clerk Edward R. McKenzie to be a chief pay clerk.

Ensign Oliver H. Ritchie to be a lieutenant (junior grade).

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants:

Raymond E. Kerr,
Emory W. Coll, and
James A. Crutchfield.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade):

Howard L. Vickery,
William Granat,
Morris H. Spriggs, and
Ralph Kiely.

Machinist William Twigg, jr., to be a chief machinist.

Lieut. Edward D. Washburn, jr., to be a lieutenant commander.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Harry D. McHenry to be a lieutenant.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants:

Willard E. Cheadle,
Harry G. Patrick,
Robert A. Hall, and
George L. Woodruff.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade):

Arthur C. Davis,
Benjamin F. Perry,
Charles F. Osborn,
Henry P. Burnett,
Forrest B. Royal,
Harvey E. Overesch,
Millard G. Gamble, and
John H. Campman.

Ensign Jesse H. Smith to be a lieutenant (junior grade).

The following-named commanders to be captains for temporary service:

Willis G. Mitchell,
John J. Hyland,
Samuel W. Bryant,
Edward S. Jackson, and
Henry L. Wyman.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders for temporary service:

Claude A. Bonvillian,
Edwin A. Wolleson,
Robert W. Cabaniss,
Claude B. Mayo,
Hamilton F. Glover,
Gardner L. Caskey,
John B. Rhodes,
George H. Bowdey,
Robert A. Theobald,
Fletcher C. Starr,
William L. Beck,
Garret L. Schuyler,
Charles F. Russell, and
Guy E. Baker.

Ensign John S. Upton to be a lieutenant (junior grade) for temporary service.

Ensign George L. H. Dolan to be a lieutenant (junior grade) for temporary service.

The following-named acting pay clerks to be assistant paymasters with the rank of ensign for temporary service:

Ralph J. H. Oldegeering,
John D. Gagan,
Robert J. Monteith,
Fillmore S. C. Layman,
Harold R. Lehmann,
Howard R. Jackson,
James M. Thomas,
John H. Skillman,
Martin M. Friedman,
Allen D. Turner,
Leon I. Smith.

Myron W. Willard,

Archie A. Antrim,

John H. Gallion,

Wayne Prather,

Charles W. Gerhardt, jr.,

Jesse A. Scott,

Harold E. Humphreys, and

Hugh A. Phares.

Francis J. Ludwig to be acting chaplain with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), for temporary service.

Rudolph Ericson to be acting chaplain with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), for temporary service.

The following-named lieutenants on the retired list to be lieutenant commanders on the retired list, for temporary service:

George Joerns,
John E. Iseman, jr.,
Walter L. Heiberg, and
Robert N. Miller.

Lieut. Charles E. Reordan to be a lieutenant commander, for temporary service.

Chief Sallmaker Michael P. Barr to be an ensign, for temporary service.

Ensign Michael P. Barr to be a lieutenant, for temporary service.

Boatswain Alva Henderson to be an ensign, for temporary service.

The following-named warrant officers, for temporary service, to be ensigns, for temporary service:

William E. Woods,
Daniel F. Kelly,
John H. Conroy, and
Oscar E. Whilden.

The following-named enlisted men to be ensigns, for temporary service:

Alfred C. Headley,
Lester Carpenter,
Thomas J. Coffee,
Bert Ketcherside,
John H. Herke,
Frank L. Miles,
David G. Gray,
Joseph L. McCann,
Howell O. Jones, and
Montie Wood.

The following-named ensigns of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be ensigns, for temporary service:

Warren H. Hastings and
Howard A. McKee.

Ensign Earl F. Chandler, of the United States Naval Reserve Force, to be an ensign, for temporary service.

Asst. Surg. Paris V. Corey, of the United States Naval Reserve Force, to be an assistant surgeon with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), for temporary service.

The following-named acting pay clerks to be assistant paymasters for temporary service, with the rank of ensign:

Howard F. Bowker,
Tipton F. Woodward,
Robert G. Robeson,
George P. Smallman,
George E. Duffy,
Chris J. Norstad,
Charles A. Cook,
Robert R. Thompson,
Allen C. Smith,
John C. Poshepny,
Gordon S. Bower,
Edward Mixon,
Henry C. McGinnis,
William F. Shaw,
Frank J. Manley,
Harry F. Hake,
Julliu J. Miffit,
Harry G. Kinnard,
William E. McCain,
Golden F. Davis,
Grandison J. Tyler,
Clyde A. Moser, and
Stamford G. Chapman.

Ensign Robert E. Sammons to be a lieutenant (junior grade) for temporary service.

Ensign Harold M. Jones, of the United States Naval Reserve Force, to be an ensign for temporary service.

The following-named chief boatswains on the retired list to be lieutenants on the retired list, for temporary service:

William Manning,
Thomas Savage,
Andrew Anderson,
John Winn,
Charles T. Chase,
Aaron B. Irelan,
Haydn Williams,
Thomas F. Greene,
James E. Quirk,
John E. Murphy,
Waldron P. Simmons,
Nelson R. King, and
Thomas L. McKenna.

The following-named boatswains on the retired list to be lieutenants on the retired list, for temporary service:

Hjalmar E. Olsen,
Charles Wouters,
Lee R. Boland, and
William H. Johnson.

The following-named chief gunners on the retired list to be lieutenants on the retired list, for temporary service:

Edward Beakes,
Isalah Wilbur, and
Charles F. Uhlrich.

The following-named gunners on the retired list to be lieutenants on the retired list, for temporary service:

Peter Hanley,
Frank A. McGregor,
Humboldt J. Palmer,
Vista R. Thompson,
Theodore C. Wester,
Arthur S. Williams, and
William Carroll.

The following-named chief machinists on the retired list to be lieutenants on the retired list, for temporary service:

James W. Murray,
Arthur T. Percival,
Adam Gibson,
Lee Grossenbaker,
James Quill,
Bernard Gebhardt,
Richard B. Smith,
George T. Brownridge,
Jacobus J. Corino,
William J. Trevorrow,
John St. C. Hothersall,
Thomas J. Hayes,
William E. Stiles,
James H. McDonough,
Martin Huber,
Frank R. Barker,
William P. Davis, and
Robert E. Rucker.

The following-named machinists on the retired list to be lieutenants on the retired list, for temporary service:

Martin Casey,
August Anschuetz,
William C. Dronberger,
Herbert E. Kershaw,
Joseph J. Duffy,
Edwin J. Cutherill,
William F. Mullinix,
Charles W. Jackson,
James Wilson,
George M. Heinen,
John O'Neil,
Peter J. Hanlon,
John McPhee, and
Max Vogt.

Chief Sailmaker Charles E. Tallman, retired, to be a lieutenant on the retired list, for temporary service.

The following-named boatswains on the retired list to be lieutenants on the retired list, for temporary service:

William Johnson and
Gustaf Dahlman.

Gunner Harry Webb, retired, to be a lieutenant on the retired list, for temporary service.

Chief Machinist Fabian P. Noel, retired, to be a lieutenant on the retired list, for temporary service.

The following-named machinists on the retired list to be lieutenants on the retired list, for temporary service:

William E. B. Grann,
William P. Little,
Anthony P. McCarthy,
Daniel J. McCarthy,
Thomas F. Hobby, and
Harlan B. Heath.

The following-named boatswains on the retired list to be lieutenants (junior grade) on the retired list, for temporary service:

Alvah M. Smith,
Charles C. Beach,
William G. A. Schwerin,
Norman McIntire,
Henry Feehan,
John L. Kelley, and
Thomas G. MacDonough.

The following-named gunners on the retired list to be lieutenants (junior grade) on the retired list for temporary service:

Edgar A. Robie,
Arthur Rogier,
John Westfall,
James Munro, and
Alfred Barker.

The following-named machinists on the retired list to be lieutenants (junior grade) on the retired list for temporary service:

Oscar Bragonier,
Herbert J. Wiseman,
Michael A. Rossiter,
Jesse E. Jones,
Edmund H. Klamt,
Charles G. Wheeler,
William C. Staufer, and
Daniel R. Shackford.

The following-named chief pharmacists on the retired list to be assistant surgeons on the retired list with the rank of lieutenant for temporary service:

John W. Wood and
John D. Milligan.

The following-named pharmacists on the retired list to be assistant surgeons on the retired list with the rank of lieutenant for temporary service:

William H. Huntington and
Isaac N. Hurd.

The following-named chief carpenters on the retired list to be assistant naval constructors on the retired list with the rank of lieutenant for temporary service:

Milton F. Roberts,
Benjamin E. Fernald,
Frederick J. Simmonds,
Harry L. Demarest,
Joseph F. McCole, and
Sverre Floathe.

The following-named carpenters on the retired list to be assistant naval constructors on the retired list with the rank of lieutenant for temporary service:

Benjamin D. Pender and
Joel D. Griffin.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

John F. Short to be United States marshal, western district of Pennsylvania.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Thomas Jones, of Oregon, to be register of the land office at Vale, Oreg.

POSTMASTERS.

MASSACHUSETTS.

James E. Cadagon, Adams.
 John H. McDonald, Andover.
 Edward J. Hayden, Athol.
 William J. Kenney, Attleboro.
 John L. Markham, Ayer.
 Henry L. Pierce, Barre.
 Charles Prescott, Beverly.
 Edward F. Delaney, Brookfield.
 James J. Harrington, Chester.
 Thomas E. Luddy, East Bridgewater.
 Forest B. Estabrook, East Northfield.
 Thomas J. Drummey, East Pepperell.
 Henry L. Ripley, Edgartown.
 Richard M. Raymond, Framington.
 John R. McComb, Great Barrington.
 Harvey F. Shufelt, Housatonic.
 Arthur W. Gibbs, Huntington.
 Edward F. Maher, Hyannis.
 James H. Lakeman, Ipswich.
 John M. Johnson, Lenox.
 Michael T. Kane, Ludlow.
 James M. Hurley, Marlboro.
 James H. Creedon, Middleboro.
 Daniel J. Dempsey, Millbury.
 Thomas F. Coady, North Attleboro.
 Elmer E. Landers, Oak Bluffs.
 Michael E. Comiskey, Plymouth.
 Frank E. Gray, Reading.
 Eugene Meagher, Rockport.
 Dennis A. Smith, Rutland.
 John H. Sheedy, Salem.
 Merton Z. Woodward, Shelburne Falls.
 Robert H. Howes, Southboro.
 Luther W. Clark, South Deerfield.
 Daniel J. O'Connell, jr., South Hadley.
 Douglas H. Knowlton, South Hamilton.
 Herbert E. Lanagan, Spencer.
 Thomas J. Costello, Springfield.
 Fannie E. Wood, Swansea.
 John O'Hearne, Taunton.
 George H. Hadley, Templeton.
 John Dobson, Townsend.
 Michael W. Hynes, Wayland.
 James Kinsley, West Acton.
 John F. O'Leary, West Warren.

TENNESSEE.

Melville B. Capps, Livingston.
 Hiram M. Moore, Portland.
 Isaac M. Steele, Ripley.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *October 1, 1918.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

"We thank Thee, our Father in heaven, that out of the worldwide war is coming a clearer and broader view of life and its purposes.

"He that findeth his life shall lose it; and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it."

What hurts one hurts all; what helps one helps all, since each man is an integral part of the human family.

Make therefore our paths straight, that we may be one with Thee in thought and purpose, and thus bear our part in the dispensation of Thy Providence, our God and our Father, in His Name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of absence for three days for my colleague, Mr. DILL, who is detained at his home by sickness.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent for three days' leave of absence for his colleague [Mr. DILL] on account of sickness. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FREAR. I ask leave of absence for my colleague, Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin, for 10 days.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks leave for his colleague for 10 days. Is there objection?

Mr. SIMS. Is it on account of illness for himself or his family?

Mr. FREAR. I am not sure. He is in Wisconsin, and it will be very difficult for him to get back sooner.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it will be so ordered. Gentlemen requesting leave of absence should fill out the printed slips.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

BILLS FROM THE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of the pending power bill it shall be in order for the Committee on Military Affairs to call up, until finally disposed of, such bills as are on the House and Union Calendars that have been favorably reported by that committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the pending bill it shall be in order to take up and consider until disposed of bills on the House and Union Calendars reported by the Committee on Military Affairs. Is there objection?

Mr. GILLETT. Reserving the right to object, I certainly do not wish to prevent any necessary or desirable military legislation. At the same time one of the important matters which ought to be considered immediately is the Unanimous Consent Calendar. I think we had better wait and see when we are going to get through with this pending bill. We can not tell from the progress we have made in the last few days how long it will take. After that is finished, then we can decide on subsequent business. For that reason I object temporarily.

Mr. DENT. I hope the gentleman will withhold that for a minute.

Mr. GILLETT. I certainly will.

Mr. DENT. Notwithstanding the fact that we are in the midst of a war, outside of the regular supply bills and the new draft legislation the Committee on Military Affairs have had only two days of the time of this House during this session of Congress for the purpose of enacting war legislation.

Mr. GILLETT. The gentleman can get the bills considered at any time he wishes, if it is important. All that is necessary is to have the Committee on Rules bring in a rule.

Mr. DENT. I will state further to the gentleman that there are only about half a dozen of these bills. I do not think they will take over one day. There will probably be three or four more bills reported by the time the occasion is reached.

Mr. GILLETT. I think for the present I will object. I would like to see the bills, and also I would like to see how soon we get through with the pending power legislation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts objects.

WINNING THE WAR.

The SPEAKER. Under the special order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LUNN] has 15 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. LUNN. Mr. Speaker, during my 15 minutes I desire not to be interrupted.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman announces that he does not wish to be interrupted during his 15 minutes.

Mr. LUNN. Mr. Speaker, 17 months after Congress declared war against the Imperial German Government the Army of the United States numbered 3,200,000 men. When we pledged all our resources in a death struggle against autocracy in all its forms we registered our determination to prosecute this war to a successful finish, regardless of cost or sacrifice.

Few realized the colossal tasks ahead of us and the almost impossible problems that had to be solved. The greatest task was that of raising and equipping an adequate army. Upon the Military Affairs Committee of the House was laid the responsibility of first deciding and recommending what, in their judgment, seemed to be the best method for providing the man power essential to the great task confronting the Nation. There were members of the committee who sincerely believed that the volunteer system should be adopted. There were others who, with equal sincerity, believed that a selective service law would constitute our strongest support.